



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,772	02/25/2004	Ross Bunker	ORACL-01437US1	2871
74739	7590	02/04/2009		
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC			EXAMINER	
Oracle International Corporation			PHAM, MICHAEL	
Attn: Patent Docketing 32nd Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Post Office Box 7037			2167	
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/786,772	Applicant(s) BUNKER ET AL.
	Examiner MICHAEL PHAM	Art Unit 2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, 20-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Detailed Action

Status of claims

1. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are pending.
2. Claims 5, 12, 19, and 22-28 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,874,143 by Murray et. al. (hereafter Murray) further in view of U.S. Patent 6,106,569 by Bohrer et. al. (hereafter Bohrer).

Claim 1:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

"a user interface;"[col. 6 line 66, user interface. Accordingly, a user interface (user interface)is disclosed]

"a plurality of services, wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension." [col. 7 lines 12-13, An

EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions.

Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs advantageously have an “open schema” which means that third party developers can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes.

Accordingly, a plurality of services (tags), wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes) is disclosed.]

“a plurality of extensions to extend an application;”[abstract, various extensions can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform.

Accordingly, a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application (incorporation into the program or platform) is disclosed.]

“wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions;”[col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 14-21, user interface elements, behaviors/component objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of services (tags) is associated with an extension (user interface elements) in the plurality of extensions (user interface elements, behaviors/component objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform) is disclosed.]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions;”[col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions provides functionality accessible in the user interface; and”[col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions (extension) provides functionality accessible in the user interface (user interface).]

“wherein one of the plurality of services provides access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions.” [col. 7 lines 11-21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements, behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of services (tags) provides access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (extensions).]

Murray does not explicitly disclose “wherein an extension includes a set of classes defined in an object-oriented programming language” and “wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes”

On the other hand, Bohrer discloses

“wherein an extension includes a set of classes defined in an object-oriented programming language” [col. 1 lines 66-67, object oriented technology provides a class as a kind of software template from which individual "objects" can be instantiated. Col. 8 lines 51-53, when the pickable extension 502 is added to the order item, it then creates an adapter object 503 which inherits from the polymorphically used pickable base class 404. Accordingly, an extension (e.g. pickable extension) includes a set of classes (e.g. base class) defined in an object oriented programming language (adaptor object)]

“wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes” [when the pickable extension is added to the order item it then creates an adaptor object 503 which inherits from the polymorphically used "pickable" base class...if the "print pick list" method is subsequently blocked, the pickable extension would delete its adaptor. The ability Accordingly, wherein the services (print pick list method) are consumed by the set of classes (adaptor object inherits from the polymorphically used "pickable" base class)]

Both Murray and Bohrer disclose methods in which to extend applications. Both are within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention, as they are both directed to providing extensions to an application. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Bohrer's disclosure above to the disclosure of Murray for the purpose of allowing behavior of the extensions to be replaced or overridden.

Claim 2:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“One of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services” [col. 7 lines 11-21].

Claim 3:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension is an interchangeable application building block” [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers].

Claim 4:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“the extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description” [col. 6 lines 64-66, EDFs] “a set of resources” [col. 7 lines 63-64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 6:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension defines handlers” [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.].

Claim 7:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information” [col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.].

Claim 8:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“providing a user interface to allow user interaction with the application;” [col. 6 line 66, user interface. Accordingly, providing a user interface to allow user interaction with the application (user interface)]

“providing a plurality of extensions to extend the application,” [abstract, various extensions can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform. Accordingly, providing a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application (incorporation into the program or platform).]

“wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of extensions to provide functionality accessible in the user interface; and” [col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 14-21, user interface elements, behaviors/component objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of extensions (extension) provides functionality accessible in the user interface (user interface) is disclosed.]

“providing a plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions;” [col. 7 lines 11-21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements, behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, providing a

plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services (tags) to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (extensions).]

“wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension;” [col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs advantageously have an “open schema” which means that third party developers can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes. Accordingly, wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes) is disclosed.]

“wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; and” [col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 14-21, user interface elements, behaviors/component objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of services (tags) is associated with an extension (user interface elements) in the plurality of extensions (user interface elements, behaviors/component objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform) is disclosed.]]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions.” [col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (EDFs).]

Murray does not explicitly disclose “wherein an extension includes a set of classes defined in an object-oriented programming language” and “wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes”

On the other hand, Bohrer discloses

“wherein an extension includes a set of classes defined in an object-oriented programming language” [col. 1 lines 66-67, object oriented technology provides a class as a kind of software template from which individual “objects” can be instantiated. Col. 8 lines 51-53, when the pickable extension 502 is added to the order item, it then creates an adapter object 503 which inherits from the polymorphically used pickable base class 404. Accordingly, an extension (e.g. pickable extension) includes a set of classes (e.g. base class) defined in an object oriented programming language (adaptor object)]

“wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes” [when the pickable extension is added to the order item it then creates an adaptor object 503 which inherits from the polymorphically used “pickable” base class...if the “print pick list” method is subsequently blocked, the pickable extension would delete its adaptor. The ability Accordingly, wherein the

services (print pick list method) are consumed by the set of classes (adaptor object inherits from the polymorphically used “pickable” base class)]

Both Murray and Bohrer disclose methods in which to extend applications. Both are within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention, as they are both directed to providing extensions to an application. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Bohrer's disclosure above to the disclosure of Murray for the purpose of allowing behavior of the extensions to be replaced or overridden.

Claim 9:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations: “one of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services.” [col. 7 lines 11-21].

Claim 10:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations: “an extension is an interchangeable application building block.” [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers].

Claim 11:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description” [col. 6 lines 64-66, EDFs] “and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources” [col. 7 lines 63-64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 13:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension defines handlers.” [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.].

Claim 14:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information.” [col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.].

Claim 15:

Murray discloses the following claimed limitations:

“provide a user interface to allow user interaction with an application;” [col. 6 line 66, user interface. Accordingly, provide a user interface to allow user interaction with the application (user interface)is disclosed]

“provide a plurality of extensions to extend the application,” [abstract, various extensions can be developed by third party developers for incorporation into the program or platform. Accordingly, provide a plurality of extensions (various extensions) to extend an application (incorporation into the program or platform)is disclosed.] “wherein the providing permits one of

the plurality of extensions to provide functionality accessible in the user interface; and” [col. 6 lines 64-66, an EDF is an XML file that logically describes an extension. For example, the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface. Accordingly, wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of extensions (extensions) provides functionality accessible in the user interface (user interface) is disclosed.]

“provide a plurality of services wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions;” [col. 7 lines 11-21, an EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. The various tags can correspond to: user interface elements, behaviour/component/objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, provide a plurality of services (tags) wherein the providing permits one of the plurality of services (tags) to provide access to functionality in one of the plurality of extensions (extensions).]

“wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation and provides access to functionality in an extension;” [col. 7 lines 12-13, An EDF, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 21-25, EDFs advantageously have an “open schema” which means that third party developers can extend the extension mechanism and include their own extensions by creating their own tags. Col. 7 line 27-29, exemplary predefined XML tags for user interface elements can include tags for feature types such as: tool bars, accelerators, menu items, and themes. Accordingly, wherein a service includes a public interface that has an implementation (open schema) and provides access to

functionality in an extension (feature types such as tool bars, accelerators, menu items and themes) is disclosed.]

“wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; and” [col. 7 lines 12-13, an edf, implemented in XML, contains various tags that are associated with various extensions. Col. 7 lines 14-21, user interface elements, behaviors/component objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform. Accordingly, wherein each one of the plurality of services (tags) is associated with an extension (user interface elements) in the plurality of extensions (user interface elements, behaviors/component objects, store elements, user-defined objects, or anything else that represents a point of extensibility in the application or platform) is disclosed.]]

“wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions.” [col. 7 lines 1-2, EDF can also contain all or part of the functionality that comprises an extension. col. 22 lines 45-46, receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Accordingly, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes (exposes) and consumes services (merges) associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions (extension).]

Murray does not explicitly disclose “wherein an extension includes a set of classes defined in an object-oriented programming language” and “wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes”

On the other hand, Bohrer discloses

“wherein an extension includes a set of classes defined in an object-oriented programming language” [col. 1 lines 66-67, object oriented technology provides a class as a kind of software template from which individual "objects" can be instantiated. Col. 8 lines 51-53, when the pickable extension 502 is added to the order item, it then creates an adapter object 503 which inherits from the polymorphically used pickable base class 404. Accordingly, an extension (e.g. pickable extension) includes a set of classes (e.g. base class) defined in an object oriented programming language (adaptor object)]

“wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes” [when the pickable extension is added to the order item it then creates an adaptor object 503 which inherits from the polymorphically used "pickable" base class...if the "print pick list" method is subsequently blocked, the pickable extension would delete its adaptor. The ability Accordingly, wherein the services (print pick list method) are consumed by the set of classes (adaptor object inherits from the polymorphically used "pickable" base class)]

Both Murray and Bohrer disclose methods in which to extend applications. Both are within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention, as they are both directed to providing extensions to an application. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Bohrer's disclosure above to the disclosure of Murray for the purpose of allowing behavior of the extensions to be replaced or overridden.

Claim 16:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“one of the plurality of extensions utilizes one of the plurality of services.” [col. 7 lines 11-21]

Claim 17:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension is an interchangeable application building block.” [col. 7 lines 25-26, extensions can themselves be extended by other developers]

Claim 18:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension includes an XML (extensible markup language) description” [col. 6 lines 64-66, EDFs] “and at least one of: 1) a set of classes; and 2) a set of resources” [col. 7 lines 63-64, classes and offline data sources.].

Claim 20:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension defines handlers.” [col. 4 lines 17-19, the use of xml advantageously enables efficient handling of extensions from multiple different extension sources.]

Claim 21:

The combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose in Murray the following claimed limitations:

“an extension provides functionality to support at least one of: 1) a document type; 2) a user interface action; 3) a file encoding; 4) property settings; and 5) debugging information.” [col. 6 lines 65-66, For example the EDF can describe HTML that makes up a user interface.]

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to the Murray reference applicant's assert the following:

A. Remarks page 9, Murray does not qualify as a 102b reference.

In response, examiner thanks applicant's for their correction. However, the rejection would have still qualified as a 102 rejection under 102e.

B. Remarks page 10, Murray does not disclose " a plurality of extensions to extend an application, wherein an extension includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented programming language; and wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions, wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes"

In response, this is moot based on new grounds of rejection that the combination of Murray and Bohrer disclose the recited limitations.

C. Remarks page 10, That the assertion in the last office action that the EDF is the claimed extension is contrary to the Offices earlier assertion that the EDF is the claimed service.

In response, the examiner disagrees with the statement. The action stated that the tags were services.

D. Remarks page 11, Murray does not disclose the claimed features of claim 1, such as an extension that includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented programming language; wherein each one of the plurality of plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions, wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes". That no where does Murray disclose that the EDF includes a set of classes programmed in an object oriented language. That instead Murray discloses the EDF is implemented in XML, and Murray does not disclose that services are consumed by a set of classes as required.

In response, this is moot, see part A.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2167